



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

100
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/940,638	08/29/2001	Takahiro Nakayama	500.40580X00	5603

20457 7590 04/18/2002

ANTONELLI TERRY STOUT AND KRAUS
SUITE 1800
1300 NORTH SEVENTEENTH STREET
ARLINGTON, VA 22209

EXAMINER

HOGANS, DAVID L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2813

DATE MAILED: 04/18/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/940,638

Applicant(s)

NAKAYAMA ET AL.

Examiner

David L. Hogans

Art Unit

2813

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 August 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 29 August 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Examiner is uncertain about how and why the quantum number of orbital angular momentum and the quantum number of the excited state spin are convertible into each other? Although these two quantum numbers explain a electrons physical properties, these physical properties are mutually exclusive and the examiner does not understand how they are convertible into each other.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

4. Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by 6,097,147 to Baldo et al.

Art Unit: 2813

In reference to Claims 1-5, Baldo et al. teaches:

Claims 1-5

- a electro-luminescent electron-hole photon layer containing 4,4'-N,N'-dicarbozole-biphenyl (CBP) with 2,3,7,8,12,13,17,18-octaethyl-21H,23H-porphine platinum (PtOEP) (See Figure 3 layer 513 and column 5 lines 40-45)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 6-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over 6,097,147 to Baldo et al in view of 6,224,966 to Sakai et al.

Baldo et al. teaches a electro-luminescent electron-hole photon layer containing 4,4'-N,N'-dicarbozole-biphenyl (CBP) with 2,3,7,8,12,13,17,18-octaethyl-21H,23H-porphine platinum (PtOEP). (See Figure 3 layer 513 and column 5 lines 40-45)

Baldo et al. fails to explicitly teach the light-emitting layer and the organic film formed by simultaneous vapor deposition. However, Examiner notes that simultaneous vapor deposition is a processing limitation and therefore carries no weight in a claim drawn to a device.

Nonetheless, Sakai et al., in columns 47-48 lines 63-10, teaches two electrically heated boats prepared in a vacuum vapor deposition chamber, where one of the boats is loaded with an organic host substance and the other is loaded with a fluorescent substance. Furthermore, Sakai et al. discloses that one would perform the simultaneous vapor deposition so that the organic light-emitting layer would be doped with the fluorescent material.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Baldo's et al. teachings in view of Sakai's et al. teachings of simultaneous vapor deposition of an organic light-emitting material with a fluorescent material. Baldo's et al. modification via Sakai's et al. teachings is obvious because the simultaneous vapor deposition allows for doping of the organic layer with a fluorescent material. Furthermore, Sakai's et al. functional use of the technique renders its application obvious.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David L. Hogans whose telephone number is (703) 305-3361. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (7:30-4:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Olik Chaudhuri can be reached on (703) 306-2794. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703)

Art Unit: 2813

308-7722 for regular communications and (703) 308-7724 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1782.



Doug Wille
Patent Examiner

dh
April 15, 2002